

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 8, 18, and 20-21 have been amended. Non-elected claims 4-7, 14-17 and 19 were previously withdrawn. Claims 1-21 are pending and under consideration.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, at pages 2-3, claims 1 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sorin (U.S. Patent No. 6,766,115).

Sorin does not discuss or suggest “a plurality of extraction units provided for each of said wavelength components, said extraction units extracting an identifier set in each of said signals of said wavelength components” or “a plurality of identifier-detecting units each associated with one of said extraction units and determining whether or not each said identifier extracted by said extraction units is normal,” as recited in amended claim 1. Sorin, as relied on by the Examiner, discloses that the heterodyne receiver generates electrical signals in response to beams that are output from the heterodyne coupler, and includes photodetectors and circuitry such as signal amplifiers and filters. (Sorin, col. 5, lines 55-60). However, the heterodyne receiver is not capable of extracting an identifier because the different delay times imparted on the port-specific signal are key to differentiating the port-specific signals from each other. In contrast, the invention of claim 1 provides a plurality of *extraction units extracting an identifier* in each of said signals of said wavelength components. Since Sorin does not provide for extracting an identifier, it would follow that Sorin does not disclose a process for determining whether or not each identifier is normal, as provided by the invention of claim 1.

Since Sorin does not discuss or suggest either “a plurality of extraction units provided for each of said wavelength components, said extraction units extracting an identifier set in each of said signals of said wavelength components” or “a plurality of identifier-detecting units each associated with one of said extraction units and determining whether or not each said identifier extracted by said extraction units is normal,” as recited in amended claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Sorin. Accordingly, withdrawal of this § 102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Similarly, Sorin does not discuss or suggest “extracting the identifier set in each of the wavelength components,” as recited in amended claim 20, or “an extraction unit extracting the identifier stored in a predetermined position in each of a plurality of wavelength components,” as

recited in amended claim 21. Therefore, claims 20 and 21 patentably distinguish over Sorin. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 102(e) rejections is respectfully requested.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, at page 3, claims 2-3 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorin.

As discussed above, independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Sorin. Claims 2-3 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and include all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 2-3 patentably distinguish over the reference relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, at pages 4-5, claims 8-13 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson (U.S. Patent No. 6,580,531).

Swanson does not discuss or suggest “wherein said judgment unit judges the optical signal being down and outputs an alarm indicating that an input of the optical signal is down when said detection result of said light-power-detecting unit indicates the optical signal is abnormal,” as recited in amended claim 8. In contrast, Swanson merely increases (or decreases) laser power bias current by a predetermined increment if a measured optical output power of the laser is not equal to a desired laser peak output power.

Further, Swanson does not discuss or suggest “judges the optical signal being degraded and outputs an alarm indicating that the optical signal is degraded when said detection result of said light-power-detecting unit indicates the optical signal is normal and said detection result of said OSNR-detecting unit regarding the optical signal corresponding to said wavelength component designates an abnormal signal-to-noise ratio,” as recited in amended claim 8. In contrast, Swanson merely compares a projected optical signal to noise ratio to a specified maximum optical signal to noise ratio for the predetermined bit error rate, and provides an indication as to whether a board under test has passed the bit error rate test.

Also, Swanson does not discuss or suggest “wherein said alarm is displayed so that the optical signal being degraded and the input of the optical signal being down can be distinguished,” as recited in amended claim 8. In other words, the invention of claim 8 provides for improved maintainability of a wavelength division-multiplexing communication system by *displaying an alarm for distinguishing* between a condition in which the optical signal is degraded

and a condition in which the optical signal is down. Swanson provides no such distinguishing feature. Thus, even if Swanson was modified as proposed in the Office Action, the invention of claim 8 would not result.

Since Swanson does not discuss or suggest “wherein said judgment unit judges the optical signal being down and outputs an alarm indicating that an input of the optical signal is down when said detection result of said light-power-detecting unit indicates the optical signal is abnormal” or “judges the optical signal being degraded and outputs an alarm indicating that the optical signal is degraded when said detection result of said light-power-detecting unit indicates the optical signal is normal and said detection result of said OSNR-detecting unit regarding the optical signal corresponding to said wavelength component designates an abnormal signal-to-noise ratio” or “wherein said alarm is displayed so that the optical signal being degraded and the input of the optical signal being down can be distinguished,” as recited in amended claim 8, claim 8 patentably distinguishes over Swanson. Accordingly, withdrawal of this § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-13 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 8, and include all the features of claim 8, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the reference relied upon. Therefore, claims 9-13 patentably distinguish over the reference relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, at page 6, claim 18 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorin and Swanson.

As discussed above, Sorin does not discuss or suggest “a plurality of extraction units provided for each of said wavelength components in said second line terminal equipment, said extraction units extracting said identifier set in each of said wavelength components,” as recited in amended claim 18. Swanson does not make up for this deficiency in Sorin. Specifically, Swanson does not discuss or suggest “a plurality of extraction units provided for each of said wavelength components in said second line terminal equipment, said extraction units extracting said identifier set in each of said wavelength components,” as recited in amended claim 18. Thus, even if Sorin and Swanson were combined, as proposed in the Office Action, the invention of claim 18 would not result. Therefore, claim 18 patentably distinguishes over Sorin and Swanson. Accordingly, withdrawal of this § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1, 8, 18, and 20-21 have been amended. Non-elected claims 4-7, 14-17 and 19 were previously withdrawn. Claims 1-21 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 8-29-06

By: 
John C. Garvey
Registration No. 28,607

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501